

REMARKS

Applicants will address each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Specification

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the specification for an informality and requests that "1D" on page 15, ln. 15 be changed to "2D." Applicants have amended the specification as requested by the Examiner and respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

The Examiner also objects to the Abstract and requests that "reduces" be changed to "reduced." Applicants have amended the abstract as requested by the Examiner and respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-4, 8-12, 14 and 15 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

While Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have canceled Claims 1-12 and amended Claim 14 to recite "the first conductive material layer."¹ As independent Claim 13 recites "a first conductive material," there is an antecedent basis for the amended term in dependent Claim 14 which should overcome the

¹ Applicants have also amended Claim 14 and Claims 18 and 22 to recite "wherein the conductive material is ~~formed~~ discharged under reduced pressure" so that these claims are consistent with the independent claims.

Examiner's objection to the claim. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9 and 12

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9 and 12 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sirringhaus et al. (US publication 2003/0059987) in view of Yudasaka et al. (US 6,514,801). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have canceled Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9 and 12, rendering this rejection moot. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10 and 11

The Examiner also rejects Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10 and 11 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sirringhaus et al. in view of Yudasaka et al. and further in view of Speakman (US 6,713,389). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have canceled Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10 and 11, rendering this rejection moot. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 13, 16, 17, 20, 21 and 24

The Examiner also rejects Claims 13, 16, 17, 20, 21 and 24 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa et al. (US 6,362,507) in view of Jacobson et al. (US 6,294,401). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

In particular, in the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Ogawa discloses that the gate electrode and the source/drain wirings are formed by sputtering instead of by discharging conductive material, as recited in independent Claims 13, 17 and 21 of the present application. The Examiner, however, contends that Jacobson teaches forming a gate electrode and the source/drain wirings by discharging material comprising nanoparticles, and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the conductive nanoparticle discharging method of Jacobson to form the electrodes and wirings of Ogawa.

While Applicants respectfully disagree, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended independent Claim 13 to recite the step of “forming a pixel electrode over the substrate by discharging a second conductive material.” Applicants respectfully submit that this feature is not disclosed or suggested by either cited reference.

For a similar reason, independent Claims 17 and 21 are also not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.²

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 13, 17 and 21 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references, and it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

² Applicants have minor amendments to Claims 17 and 21 to correct punctuation errors therein.

Claims 14, 15, 18, 19, 22 and 23

The Examiner also rejects Claims 14, 15, 18, 19, 22 and 23 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa et al. in view of Jacobson et al. and further in view of Speakman (US 6,713,389). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicants are also adding new Claims 25-52. These claims are also directed to a method of manufacturing a semiconductor device, wherein a gate electrode, a gate wiring, source and drain wirings, and a first electrode are formed by discharging conductive materials.

It is respectfully requested that these new claims be entered and allowed.

The fee for new claims has been calculated as shown below.

	Claims Remaining After Amendment		Highest Number Previously Paid For	Present Extra	Rate	Fee
Total	40	-	24	16	(small entity) x 25 (others) x 50	\$ 800.00
Independent	7	-	6	1	(small entity) x 100 (others) x 200	\$ 200.00
Multiple Dependent (None)					(small entity) + 180	
					(others) + 360	\$
TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEES						\$1,000.00

Applicants are enclosing the \$ 1,000.00 fee for the new claims and, new independent claims.
If any further fee is due, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are also submitting an information disclosure statement (IDS) herewith.
Applicants are also in the process of preparing a further IDS. It is respectfully requested that these
IDSs be entered and considered prior to the issuance of a further action for this application.

If any further fee should be due for this IDS, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Conclusion


Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for
allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our Deposit Account
50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 15, 2005


Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500
Customer no. 000026568